

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action mailed on July 15, 2009, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10-12, 15, 24, 25, 27, 29, and 31 are rejected. Additionally, claims 26, 28, 30, and 32-34 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Furthermore, claims 1 and 10, and the specification are objected to. In response, Applicant proposes amending claims 1, 10, 33, and 34, canceling claims 26 and 32, and adding new claims 35 and 36. Additionally, Applicant proposes amending the specification. Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments be entered to put the claims in condition for allowance. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks.

### Objections to the Specification

The Final Office Action states that the terms “1,0” and “0,44” in the paragraph beginning with “In Fig. 4” on page 7, line 3 should be replaced with the terms “1.0” and “0.44,” respectively. In response, Applicant proposes amending the specification to recite that this “integrated circuit features high RF isolation (38 dB at 1.0 GHz) and low insertion loss (0.44 dB at 1.0 GHz) and makes use of low voltage CMOS logic control.” Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

### Claim Objections

The Final Action states that the phrases “one branch port,” “the rest,” and “one of said first switches” in claims 1 and 10 should be replaced with the phrases “*a respective branch port*,” “*the remainder*,” and “*a corresponding one of said first switches*,” respectively. In response, Applicant proposes amending claims 1 and 10 to replace the phrases “one branch port,” “the rest,” and “one of said first switches” with the phrases “*a respective branch port*,” “*the remainder*,” and “*a corresponding one of said first*

*switches,”* respectively. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests that the claim objections be withdrawn.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s review of and determination that claims 26, 28, 30, and 32-34 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Final Office Action states that claims 26, 28, 30, and 32-34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Independent Claims 1 and 10

Applicant proposes amending independent claims 1 and 10 to include the individual limitations of dependent claims 26 and 32, respectively. As a result of the proposed amendments to independent claims 1 and 10, Applicant proposes canceling dependent claims 26 and 32. Additionally, Applicant proposes amending dependent claims 33 and 34 to reflect the correct claim dependency. Because amended claims 1 and 10 recite allowable subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1 and 10 are in condition for allowance.

#### Dependent Claims 4-6, 8, 11, 12, 15, 24, 25, 27-31, 33, and 34

Dependent claims 4-6, 8, 24, 25, 27, and 28 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 4-6, 8, 24, 25, 27, and 28 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

Dependent claims 11, 12, 15, 29-31, 33, and 34 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 10. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 11, 12, 15, 29-31, 33, and 34 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10.

New claims 35 and 36

Applicant proposes adding new claims 35 and 36. Specifically, Applicant proposes adding independent claim 35 to include all of the limitations of independent claim 1 (as filed on May 12, 2009) and the individual limitations of dependent claims 6, 27, and 28 (as filed on May 12, 2009). Because independent claim 35 recites allowable subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 35 is in condition for allowance.

Additionally, Applicant proposes adding dependent claim 36, which is similar to claim 24 (as filed on May 12, 2009). Dependent claim 36 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of independent claim 35. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 36 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 35.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: August 26, 2009

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111